

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|--|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/700,857 | 11/04/2003 | Young H. Kim | CL2207USNA | 6319 |
| 43693 7 | 590 09/22/2006 | EXAM | EXAMINER | |
| | ORTH AMERICA S.A LE FALLS CENTRE/10 | TRAN, THAO T | | |
| | VILLE ROAD | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| WILMINGTO | N, DE 19808 | 1711 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Ę, | |
|---------------|----|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| dress | | |
| 0) DAYS, | | |
| ommunication. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| merits is | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| FR 1.121(d) | | |
| O-152. | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| | Application No. | 'Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | 10/700,857 | KIM ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Thao T. Tran | 1711 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 h | Narch 2006. | | | | | |
| · · | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowa | <i>,</i> — | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

Art Unit: 1711

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This is in response to the Reply filed on 01/05/2006. The petition for revival of this application filed on 01/05/2005 has been approved and the abandonment has been withdrawn.
- 2. Claims 1-29 are currently pending in this application. There has been no change of the claims in this Reply.
- 3. In view of further consideration, the rejections of the claims, as being unpatentable over Soto '325 or Taub '131 and in combination with Bialke '475, in the prior Office action have been withdrawn. A new rejection is issued as follows.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 1, it is suggested that "Claims 1, 10 and 20" change to --claim 1, 10, or 20--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 20-22, 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bialke et al. (US Pat. 6,794,475).

Bialke discloses an aqueous polyurethane-urea dispersion (PUD) used in making gloves (see abstract; col. 1, ln. 6-9), the PUD dispersion comprising polymerized units of disocyanate

and hydrophilic moiety, and of polyols. The diisocyanates include toluene diisocyanate. The polyols include polyesters, such as polyester of adipic acid and ethylene glycol (see col. 8, ln. 39-59). The hydrophilic moiety is dimethylol propionic acid (see col. 9, ln. 20-21). Note that the propionic acid is to provide the hydrophilic moiety into the PUD to stabilize the dispersion in water, thus it is a surfactant. Moreover, Bialke teaches the use of surfactants in the dispersion (see col. 9, ln. 67).

The reference further discloses that branching agents and crosslinking agents are optional (see col. 9, ln. 32-33, paragraph crossing col. 9-10) or that the PUD comprises diol, diamine, or both (see col. 8, ln. 42-44). Thus, the PUD of Bialke can be exclusive of the chain extenders or crosslinker and would inherently have the same concentration of urea as presently claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bialke et al. (US Pat. 6,794,475) as applied to claims 20-21 above.

Bialke is as set forth in claims 20-21 above and incorporated herein.

Bialke teaches the use of dimethylolpropionic acid, and not 2,2-dimethanolpropionic acid. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that substituting one

Art Unit: 1711

acid for another would have been given the same effects because these two propionic acids have been used as alternatives of each other in the art.

9. Claims 1-19, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bialke as applied to claims 20-22 and 24-29 above, and in view of Soto et al. (US Pat. 5,008,325) or Taub (US Pat. 3,404,131).

Bialke is as set forth in claims 20-22 and 24-29 above and incorporated herein.

Bialke discloses the polyols to be polyethers including alkylene oxides, such as ethylene oxide, propylene oxide and tetrahydrofuran (see col. 9, ln. 4-6).

Bialke, however, does not disclose the use of a copolymer of tetrahydrofuran and an alkylene oxide and/or a cyclic acetal; or the molecular weight of the polyether.

Soto teaches a film prepared from an ionic polyurethane-urea polymer using a polyether polyol of tetrahydrofuran and ethylene oxide and/or propylene oxide copolymer (see col. 6, ln. 22-43) having a molecular weight of 800-2000 (see col. 5, ln. 11).

Taub teaches a film made of polyether-urethane-urea polymer using a polyether polyol copolymer of tetrahydrofuran and ethylene oxide or propylene oxide, having a molecular weight of 1000 to 2000 (see col. 2, ln. 52-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have employed the copolymer polyol, as taught by Soto or Taub, in the PUD of Bialke. The use of a polyether polyol copolymer has been known to enhance stabilization effect of the PUD in a continuous phase and color stability of the product.

Application/Control Number: 10/700,857 Page 5

Art Unit: 1711

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 3/29/2006, with respect to the rejections of the claims as unpatentable over Soto '325 and Taub '131 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made above.

Contact Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thao T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-1080. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, from 9:00 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 6

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1711

September 13, 2006